

VZCZCXYZ8010
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #2031/01 2611524
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O 181524Z SEP 06
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6824
INFO RUEHCP/AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN PRIORITY 6617
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS PRIORITY 1304
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

S E C R E T THE HAGUE 002031

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/MTR, EUR/UBI

E.O. 12958: DECL: 09/19/2016
TAGS: [MTCRE](#) [ETTC](#) [KSCA](#) [MNUC](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [NL](#)
SUBJECT: NETHERLANDS/MTCR: PLENARY PAPERS, UAV/CRUISE
MISSILE COMMENTS

REF: A. STATE 149547

- [1](#)B. STATE 149559
- [1](#)C. STATE 149566
- [1](#)D. STATE 149612
- [1](#)E. STATE 152294
- [1](#)F. STATE 152615
- [1](#)G. STATE 134060

Classified By: POLCOUNS Andrew Schofer for reasons 1.4 (b,d)

[1](#)1. (S) Summary: The GONL appreciates the opportunity to review U.S. papers in preparation for the October 2-6, 2006 Plenary in Copenhagen, but has concerns regarding U.S. unwillingness to deliver pre-launch notifications as part of the Hague Code of Conduct. They also believe the U.S. proposal on modernizing MTCR controls on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and cruise missiles lacks sufficient explanations to justify the changes proposed in the non-paper. The Dutch suggest the USG has ulterior motives for the proposed changes, to which Russia will most like object. Polmiloff discussed these issues with MFA Senior Advisor for Nuclear and Nonproliferation Issues Ceta Noland on September 18. End summary.

[1](#)2. (S) Polmiloff discussed the U.S. papers (refs A-F) with Noland in preparation for the upcoming MTCR plenary in Copenhagen. Noland appreciated the papers, and said she would pass them on to relevant agencies for comment prior to the plenary in October.

[1](#)3. (C) In response to the "U.S. Report on Contacts with Non-Partners" (ref E), Noland noted that as an EU member state, the GONL greatly appreciates U.S. outreach efforts to MTCR non-Partners, especially with regard to the Hague Code of Conduct (HCOC). She added, however, that the USG failure to deliver pre-launch notifications under the HCOC threatens such efforts. She argued that "even Russia" lives up "for the most part" to its HCOC commitments, and suggested Russia might be more inclined to try and revise or even depart the HCOC, given the USG's unwillingness to deliver pre-launch notification. She acknowledged that these concerns had already been delivered to Washington both bilaterally and through the EU Presidency.

[1](#)4. (C) Noland also passed on GONL comments to the U.S. non-paper on modernizing MTCR controls on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and cruise missiles (ref G). She said that even with the additional explanatory note, the non-paper lacked sufficient explanations to validate the paper's proposed values and thresholds. She suggested the USG might

have ulterior motives, including the reclassification of a Russian cruise missile as Category I under this latest proposal. As such, she highly doubted Russia would support the U.S. proposal.

¶5. (C) Noland described the new USG position on UAVs as quite complex and "difficult to gauge." Following Sept. 11, she said the USG characterized all UAVs as dangerous weapons requiring strict controls. Given the new criteria proposed by the U.S., she suggested the USG was looking to bolster its defense industry with UAV sales. She also wondered if the USG proposal had been "harmonized" with the Wasenaar Arrangement, which also governs UAVs.

¶6. (C) Specifically, Noland questioned why certain UAV values were chosen (launch or takeoff weight of 900 kg, 500 kg payload, sea level airspeed greater than 800 km per hour) and how these values would strengthen the regime. She pointed to a UK proposal to 19.A.3 that suggests UAV payloads be restricted to 20 liters, and said the GONL was more inclined to agree with this more restrictive payload, especially given how little a terrorist would need to make a UAV armed and dangerous. She suggested 50 kg might be a more appropriate UAV payload. She also said certain terms were not clearly defined under the MTCR, such as "rocket propelled air vehicles".

¶7. (C) Noland acknowledged that the GONL recognizes the obvious difference between UAVs and cruise missiles. But the USG needed to make a better case explaining why the values in its paper would benefit the regime. She also said more attention should be paid to UAV components, which are not currently controlled. Noland suggested it was relatively easy to acquire the components necessary to build a UAV. She said the Dutch would present on this topic during the plenary session's intelligence exchange based on its own UAV

catch-all case history.

ARNALL